

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**BECKLEY DIVISION**

JESSIE YARBOROUGH,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:15-cv-04644

WARDEN JOE COAKLEY, et al.,

Respondents.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

On April 15, 2015, the Petitioner, acting *pro se*, filed his Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of *Habeas Corpus* by a Person in State or Federal Custody (Document 1), along with his Affidavit (Document 2) and Memorandum in Support (Document 3).

By *Standing Order* (Document 5) entered on April 17, 2015, this matter was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. Subsequently, by *Order* (Document 10) entered on January 6, 2016, the case was referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition.

On February 25, 2016, Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn submitted a *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document 12), wherein it is recommended that this Court dismiss the Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of *Habeas Corpus* by a Person in State or Federal

Custody (Documents 1 & 3) and remove this matter from the Court's docket. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* were due by March 14, 2016.<sup>1</sup>


Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*. The Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*, and **ORDERS** that Petitioner's Application Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 for Writ of *Habeas Corpus* by a Person in State or Federal Custody (Documents 1 & 3) be **DISMISSED** and that this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

Lastly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Petitioner's *Application to Proceed Without Prepayment of Fees and Costs* (Document 8) be **DENIED**.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: March 17, 2016

  
IRENE C. BERGER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

---

<sup>1</sup>The docket reflects that the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* mailed to the Petitioner was returned as undeliverable on March 16, 2016.